

REMARKS

Office Action Summary

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 2, 11, 13-14 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Braathen et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,305,233 (hereinafter “Braathen”). Claims 3-10, 12, and 15-21 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but otherwise allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

Status of Claims

At the time the Office Action was mailed, claims 1-22 were pending in the application. By way of the present response, claim 1 has been canceled without prejudice and claims 2, 3, 11, 12, 15 and 22 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 2-22 are pending in the application.

Claim Objections

Claims 3-10 and 12

Claim 3 has been rewritten in independent form and amended to include all of the limitations of claim 1 from which it originally depended. Accordingly, applicants submit that claim 3 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 12 has been amended to depend from claim 3. Given that claims 4-10 and 12 depend from claim 3, either directly or indirectly, and include all of the limitations of claim 3, applicants submit that claims 4-10 and 12 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 15-20

Claim 15 has been rewritten in independent form and amended to include all of the limitations of claim 13 from which it originally depended. Accordingly, applicants submit that claim 15 is in condition for allowance.

Given that claims 16-20 depend from claim 15, either directly or indirectly, and include all of the limitations of claim 15, applicants submit that claims 16-20 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 21

Claim 21 has been rewritten in independent form and amended to include all of the limitations of claim 13 from which it originally depended. Accordingly, applicants submit that claim 15 is in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102(e)

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been canceled without prejudice. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 is moot.

Claim 2

The Office Action rejects claim 2 without providing any argument that the reference discloses, “wherein the packet arrival time is used to adjust a variable sample delay of the demodulated received signal,” as recited in claim 2. Applicants respectfully submit that the reference does not disclose such a limitation. Claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the claim from which it originally depended. Accordingly, applicants submit that claim 2 is patentable over Braathen.

Claim 11

Claim 11 has been amended to depend from claim 3. Accordingly, applicants submit that claim 11 is patentable over Braathen.

Claims 13 and 14

The Office Action rejects claim 13 without providing any argument that the reference discloses the limitation “comparing an index of the maximum with the output of a modulo-L counter to produce a packet arrival time at a symbol period boundary of the received signal,” as recited in claim 13. Applicants submit that the reference does not disclose such a limitation. Accordingly, applicants submit that claim 13 is patentable over Braathen.

The Office Action rejects claim 14 without providing any argument that the reference discloses “using the packet arrival time to adjust a variable sample delay of the demodulated received signal” as recited in claim 14. Applicants respectfully submit that

the reference does not disclose such a limitation. Nevertheless, given that claim 14 depends from claim 13, and includes all of its limitations, applicants submit that claim 14 is patentable over Braathen.

Claim 22

Claim 22 has been amended to include the limitation “wherein correlating includes correlating real and imaginary components of the demodulated received signal with real and imaginary components of the stored preamble to produce a real correlator output and an imaginary correlator output, and summing the real correlator output with the imaginary correlator output to produce the correlated output.” As the Office Action acknowledges with respect to the allowable subject matter of claim 3, this limitation is not disclosed not disclosed by Braathen. Therefore, applicants submit that claim 22 is patentable over Braathen.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, applicants respectfully submit that all objections and rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 8/20/04



Richard W. Thill
Reg. No. 53,686

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
Tel.: (408) 720-8300